

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and Determination of NEPA
Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

DNA-AZ-110-2005-0047

A. **BLM Office:** Arizona Strip Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File
No. _____

Proposed Action Title/Type: Oil and Gas Lease Offers: July 2005

Description of the Proposed Action: The Arizona State Office has proposed to conduct an oil and gas competitive lease sale in July 2005. The described land tracts are located within the Arizona Strip Field Office and have been requested by the public. Pursuant to the enactment of Section 2509 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the primary term of all competitive oil and gas leases is 10 years. In the event the tracts are not leased competitively, they would become available for non-competitive leasing for a period of two years. If non-competitive leases are issued, they too would have a term of 10 years.

Location of Proposed Action: The following is a list of lands that are proposed for offering at a competitive oil and gas lease sale scheduled for July 2005:

Legal Descriptions:**Acreage:****T. 40 N., R. 5 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ**

Sec. 18, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	626.84
Sec. 20, W1/2;	320.00
Sec. 21, E1/2.	320.00
Sec. 28, E1/2;	320.00
Sec. 29, W1/2;	320.00
Sec. 30, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2;	309.32
Sec. 31, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2, E1/2W1/2.	630.04
Sec. 33, E1/2;	320.00
Sec. 34, NW1/4	160.00

T. 40 N., R. 6 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 13, All;	640.00
Sec. 24, All;	640.00
Sec. 25, All;	640.00

Sec. 26, All;	640.00
---------------	--------

T. 40 N., R. 7 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 3, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	601.28
Sec. 7, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2.	624.80
Sec. 8, All;	640.00
Sec. 9, All;	640.00
Sec. 10, All;	640.00
Sec. 11, All;	640.00
Sec. 14, All;	640.00
Sec. 15, All;	640.00
Sec. 17, All;	640.00
Sec. 18, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2.	625.40
Sec. 19, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	625.96
Sec. 21, All;	640.00
Sec. 22, All;	640.00
Sec. 23, All;	640.00
Sec. 24, All;	640.00
Sec. 27, All;	640.00
Sec. 28, All;	640.00
Sec. 29, All;	640.00
Sec. 30, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	626.52
Sec. 31, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	626.84
Sec. 33, All;	640.00

T. 40 N., R. 9 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 1, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	606.04
Sec. 2, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	607.12
Sec. 3, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	608.12
Sec. 4, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	608.72
Sec. 5, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	608.76
Sec. 6, Lots 1 thru 7, inclusive, S1/2NE1/4, SE1/4NW1/4, E1/2SW1/4, SE1/4;	581.06
Sec. 7, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	611.88
Sec. 8, All;	640.00
Sec. 9, All;	640.00
Sec. 10, All;	640.00
Sec. 11, All;	640.00
Sec. 12, All;	640.00

Sec. 13, All;	640.00
Sec. 14, All;	640.00
Sec. 15, All;	640.00
Sec. 17, All;	640.00
Sec. 18, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	612.16
Sec. 19, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	612.44
Sec. 20, All;	640.00
Sec. 21, All;	640.00
Sec. 22, All;	640.00
Sec. 23, All;	640.00
Sec. 24, All;	640.00
Sec. 25, All;	640.00
Sec. 26, All;	640.00
Sec. 27, All;	640.00
Sec. 28, All;	640.00
Sec. 29, All;	640.00
Sec. 30, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	612.84
Sec. 31, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	612.92
Sec. 33, All;	640.00
Sec. 34, All;	640.00
Sec. 35, All;	640.00

T. 41 N., R. 7 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 27, All;	640.00
Sec. 28, All;	640.00
Sec. 30, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, E1/2W1/2, E1/2;	638.72
Sec. 35, All;	640.00

T. 41 N., R. 11 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 2, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	641.24
Sec. 3, Lots 1 thru 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, S1/2;	642.44
Sec. 4, Lots 1 and 2, S1/2NE1/4, SE1/4;	321.19
Sec. 9, E1/2;	320.00
Sec. 10, All;	640.00
Sec. 11, All;	640.00
Sec. 13, W1/2;	320.00
Sec. 14, All;	640.00
Sec. 15, All;	640.00
Sec. 16, E1/2;	320.00

Sec. 20, All;	640.00
---------------	--------

Sec. 21, All;	640.00
---------------	--------

Sec. 22, All;	640.00
---------------	--------

T. 42 N., R. 7 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 31, Lots 5 and 6, inclusive, E1/2SW1/4, SE1/4;	315.05
---	--------

Sec. 33, S1/2;	320.00
----------------	--------

Sec. 34, S1/2;	320.00
----------------	--------

Sec. 35, Lot 4, W1/2SW1/4;	105.83
----------------------------	--------

T. 42 N., R. 8 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 33, S1/2;	320.00
----------------	--------

T. 42 N., R. 11 W., G&SRM, Mohave County, AZ

Sec. 34, SW1/4;	160.00
-----------------	--------

Sec. 35, S1/2;	320.00
----------------	--------

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (1992), as amended (1998); Shivwits Resource Area Implementation Plan for the Arizona Strip District Approved Resource Management Plan (1992); The Vermillion Resource Area Implementation Plan for the Arizona Strip District Approved Resource Management Plan (1992); Presidential Proclamation, Establishment of the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument (2000); Presidential Proclamation, Establishment of the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument (2000); Interim Management Policy for Newly Created National Monuments (2000); Interim Management Policy for Bureau of Land Management National Monuments and National Conservation Areas (2001).

The Resource Management Plan (RMP) states further, “Allow entire unit (District) to remain open to mineral leasing, location and sale except where restricted by wilderness designation, withdrawals, or specific areas identified in this plan.” Oil and gas leasing and development are allowed under the authority of the following: the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act (FOOGLRA) of 1987.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision:

MI02: In the Arizona Strip District Office designate 1,616,106 acres open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions; designate 185,807 acres open to lease subject to special terms and conditions or seasonal restrictions; designate 98,375 open to leasing subject to

no surface occupancy stipulations; designate 80,710 acres closed to oil and gas leasing. The Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument and Vermilion Cliffs National Monument are closed to oil and gas leasing.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (1992), as amended (1998).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The RMP identifies specific areas as being available for oil and gas leasing. All of the proposed tracts are located on lands identified available for oil and gas leasing. None of the proposed tracts are in the Grand Canyon-Parashant or Vermilion Cliffs National Monuments, which are closed to mineral leasing. A stipulation for visual resource management class II lands would be included on the appropriate tracts, as identified in the RMP.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The alternatives range from making lands available for lease with standard lease terms through closing the lands to fluid mineral leasing. Environmental concerns and resource values are addressed by attaching special lease terms and conditions, seasonal restrictions or no surface occupancy designations.

3. Is existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered,

proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Following the amended RMP and FEIS the Grand Canyon-Parashant and Vermilion Cliffs National Monuments were created and there was the reintroduction of the California Condor experimental, non-essential 10 (j) population. The proposed tracts are not in the Grand Canyon-Parashant or Vermilion Cliffs National Monuments nor are they proximal to areas frequented by the reintroduced California Condor populations. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude these new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The methodology and analytical approach used in the existing RMP and FEIS, as amended, is substantially the same as those used in recent NEPA documents and continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Do the existing NEPA documents analyze impacts related to the current proposed action at a level of specificity appropriate to the proposal (plan level, programmatic level, project level)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those identified in the RMP and EIS, as amended. The existing NEPA document analyzed impacts related to the current proposal at both plan and programmatic levels, which is appropriate for the current proposal.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative

impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

 X Yes

 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is the same as the action analyzed in the RMP and EIS, as amended. Therefore, no additional analysis or information is needed to conclude the cumulative impacts from the current proposal are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

 X Yes

 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The RMP and EIS, as amended underwent extensive interagency review with open public involvement, which is considered adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Gloria Benson	Native American Coordinator	Native American Nations
Rody Cox	Geologist	Minerals, Geology
Tom Folks	Recreation Planner	Recreation, Wilderness, VRM
Laurie Ford	Realty Specialist	Lands, Realty, Minerals
John Herron	Archeologist	Cultural
Michael Herder	Wildlife Biologist	T & E Animals
Lee Hughes	Ecologist	T & E Plants
Linda Price	Range Conservationist	Standards & Guides
Bob Sandberg	Range Conservationist	Range
Richard Spotts	Environmental Coordinator	NEPA
Roger Taylor	Field Office Manager	Management
Ron Wadsworth	Supervisory LEO	Law Enforcement

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures.

Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

1. In order to protect important scenic values in a visual resource management class II area, all changes to landforms or vegetation caused by oil and gas exploration shall be done very subtly. Proposed changes may be seen, but should not attract attention. Exceptions to this limitation may be specifically authorized in writing by the authorized officer of the surface management agency if it is shown to the satisfaction of the officer that the proposed disturbance or occupancy will not impair the visual resources of the area.

2. The lease area may now or hereafter contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid BLM-approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the Endangered Species Act as amended, 16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq., including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.

Lease Notice: The leasing of these lands does not constitute a ground disturbing activity, but subsequent APD will. The potential Leaser should be informed that APD authorization may require that they fund various actions to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act including but not limited to inventory, Section 106 consultation, and mitigation of any adverse impact to potential NRHP sites.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that:

Plan Conformance:

- ☐ This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

- ☐ The existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date